

Appendix E:

SRFB Review Panel Evaluation Criteria

To help ensure that every project funded by the SRFB is technically sound, the SRFB Review Panel will note for the SRFB any projects it believes have:

- Low benefit to salmon
- A low likelihood of being successful
- Costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits of the project

Projects that have a low benefit to salmon, a low likelihood of success, or that have costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits will be designated as projects of concern. The review panel will not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects. It is expected that projects will follow best management practices and will meet local, state, and federal permitting requirements.

When a project of concern is identified, the review panel chair will contact the regional recovery organization that represents the area in which the project is located¹. The review panel chair will discuss project issues and work with the regional recovery organization and representative from regional technical team advisors to determine if the issues can be resolved before the list of “projects of concern” is presented to the board. This may require additional communication with the project sponsor, lead entity coordinator, and the regional recovery organization.

¹ For Puget Sound, this will be the Puget Sound Regional Implementation Technical Team chair.

Criteria

For acquisition and restoration projects, the panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot be significantly improved if:

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing. For acquisition projects, this criterion relates to the lack of a clear threat if the property is not acquired.
2. Information provided, or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
 - A. Incomplete application or proposal.
 - B. Project goal or objectives not clearly stated; or do not address salmon habitat protection or restoration.
 - C. Project sponsor has not responded to review panel comments.
 - D. Acquisition parcel prioritization (for multi-site proposals) is not provided or the prioritization does not meet the projects goal or objectives.
3. The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.
4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor has failed to justify the costs to the satisfaction of the review panel.
5. The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
6. The project may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments, or restoration actions in the watershed.
7. The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes, or prohibits natural processes.
8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated goals or objectives.
9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated goals or objectives.
10. There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the project is not completed.
11. The project design is not adequate or the project is sited improperly.

12. The stewardship description is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance and this likely would jeopardize the project's success.
13. The main focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.

Additional Criteria for Planning Projects

For planning projects (e.g., assessment, design, inventories, and studies), the review panel will consider the criteria for acquisition and restoration projects (1-13) and the following additional criteria. The review panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot be improved significantly if:

14. The project does not address an information need important to understanding the watershed, is not directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will not clearly lead to beneficial projects.
15. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.
16. There are significant constraints to the implementation of projects following completion of the planning project.
17. The project does not clearly lead to project design or does not meet the criteria for filling a data gap.
18. The project does not appear to be coordinated with other efforts in the watershed; or does not use appropriate methods and protocols.